arXiv:1407.4554v1 [math.CV] 17 Jul 2014

# A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO THE MODULI SPACE OF QUASI-HOMOGENEOUS SINGULARITIES

LEONARDO M. CÂMARA AND BRUNO SCÁRDUA

Abstract. We study the relationship between singular holomorphic foliations in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ and their separatrices. Under mild conditions we describe a complete set of analytic invariants characterizing foliations with quasi-homogeneous separatrices. Further, we give the full moduli space of quasi-homogeneous plane curves. This paper has an expository character in order to make it accessible also to non-specialists.

## 1. Introduction

In this this paper we deal with the classification of germs of curves and germs of holomorphic foliations in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ (cf. Theorems A and B). The problem of the classification of germs of analytic plane curves has been addressed by several authors since the XVII$^{\text{th}}$ century with different methods (see for instance [2], [3], [21]). In the first part of the present work, we study the problem of the analytic classification of germs of singular curves with many branches from the viewpoint of Holomorphic Foliations. This allows the use of geometrical techniques including the blow-up and holonomy which are related to the study of normal forms for quasi-homogeneous polynomials in two variables.

Next, we use the standard resolution of theses singularities in order to stratify them and thus identify the moduli space of each stratum. As a consequence, our method provides an effective way to identify if two quasi-homogeneous curves are equivalent. Further, remark that the analytic type of a quasi-homogeneous curve is one of the invariants which determine the analytic type of a foliation having such a curve as separatrix set (cf. Theorem B). Therefore, the present classification completes the classification of such germs of complex analytic foliations.

On the other hand, the problem of local classification of differential equations of the form $Adx + Bdy = 0$ in two variables has been studied by various mathematicians — since the end of the nineteenth century — as C. A. Briot, J. C. Bouquet, H. Dulac, H. Poincaré, I. Bendixson, G. D. Birkhoff, C. L. Siegel, A. D. Brjuno *et Al.* In the middle 1970s R. Thom restored the interest in this question with a series of talks at IHES. In fact, he conjectured that a germ of a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ with a finite number of separatrices, i.e. a finite number of analytic invariant curves through the origin, has its analytic type characterized by its holonomy with respect to the separatrix set (cf. [13], pp. 162, 163). In [25], [26], and [27] it is proved that the conjecture has an affirmative answer if the linear part of the vector field defining the foliation is non-nilpotent. In [28] it is proved that the conjecture is not true in general with the introduction of an analytic invariant called vanishing holonomy. Further, in [5] it is proved that any germ of a singular holomorphic foliation in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ has a nonempty separatrix set, which is denoted by $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F})$. Since this time, the problem of finding a complete set of analytic invariants determining the analytic type of a germ of a foliation in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ having a finite number of separatrices is known as Thom's problem (cf.[16], pp. 60, 98). In [13] the results of [28] are generalized, classifying a Zariski open subset of the nilpotent singularities in terms of the vanishing holonomy (now called

*Key words and phrases.* Singular holomorphic foliations, holonomy groups, quasi-homogeneous curves.
This work was partially supported by CAPES-PROCAD grant nº 0007056.
2010 Math. Subj. Class. 37F75, 32S65, 32S45.

projective holonomy). Other contributions have been given by many authors such as [4], [16], [31], etc.

In [24] the problem of moduli space is studied from the deformation viewpoint. There it is proved that the moduli space of local unfoldings of quasi-homogeous foliations is determined by the conjugacy class of the projective holonomy and the analytic type of its separatrix set for a generic class of foliations called quasi-hyperbolic (cf. [24], Definition 1.1, p. 255; Theorem B, p. 256; and Definition 6.8, p. 273). Namely, a germ of a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ is called *quasi-hyperbolic generic* provided that the following conditions are satisfyed: (i) its resolution $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ has at least one non-solvable projective holonomy; (ii) $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ has no saddle-nodes and the ratio between the eigenvalues of each of its singular points is not a negative real number. After, in [17] it is proved that any two quasi-hyperbolic generic quasi-homogeous foliations can be linked by such kind of unfoldings, classifying the quasi-hyperbolic generic quasi-homogeous foliations.

Here, from a quite different viewpoint, we show in the second part of this work an analogous result with less restrictive hypotheses on the foliation $\mathcal{F}$ (cf. Theorem B), using a geometric and much simpler proof. In fact, this geometrical approach leads also to the classification of curves.

Finally, we would like to remark that one of the main sources of inspiration for this work was the relationship between singular holonomies (cf. e.g. [7], [8], [9], [10]) and the analytic type of a foliation near their Hopf components (see definition below). Furthermore, our approach can be used to understand the moduli space of more general germs of singular foliations, for instance, in the presence of saddle nodes.

The plan of the article is as follows. First we determine normal forms for quasi-homogeneous algebraic curves obtaining some geometric properties for the resolution of the separatrix set. With this geometric features at hand, we determine the moduli space in terms of the moduli space of punctured Riemann spheres. In the sequel, we study the semilocal invariants of resolved foliation determining the analytic type of each Hopf component of the foliation. Then we introduce natural cocycles that measure the obstruction for two analytically componentwise equivalent foliations to be really analytically equivalent. Finally we use the geometric description of the separatrix set in order to trivialize these cocycles and construct an explicit conjugation between two foliations with the same quasi-homogeneous curve and analytically conjugate projective holonomies.

## Part 1. Classification of curves

### 2. Preliminaries

Let $C$ be a singular curve and $\pi : (\mathcal{M}, D) \longrightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ its standard resolution, i.e. the minimal resolution of $C$ whose *strict transform* $\widetilde{C} := \pi^{-1}(C)\backslash D$ is transversal to the exceptional divisor $D = \pi^{-1}(0)$. A germ of a holomorphic function $f \in \mathbb{C}\{x, y\}$ is said to be *quasi-homogeneous* if there is a local system of coordinates in which $f$ can be represented by a quasi-homogeneous polynomial, i.e. $f(x, y) = \sum_{ai+bj=d} a_{ij} x^i y^j$ where $a, b, d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $M$ be a manifold and $M_\Delta(n) := \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in M^n : x_i \neq x_j \text{ for all } i \neq j\}$. Let $S_n$ denote the group of permutations of $n$ elements and consider its action in $M_\Delta(n)$ given by $(\sigma, \lambda) \mapsto \sigma \cdot \lambda = (\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \cdots, \lambda_{\sigma(n)})$. The quotient space induced by this action is denoted by $\mathrm{Symm}(M_\Delta(n))$. Now suppose a Lie group $G$ acts in $M$ and let $G$ act in $M_\Delta(n)$ in the natural way $(g, \lambda) = (g \cdot \lambda_1, \cdots, g \cdot \lambda_n)$ for every $\lambda \in M_\Delta(n)$. Then the actions of $G$ and $S_n$ in $M_\Delta(n)$ commute. Thus one obtains a natural action of $G$ in $\mathrm{Symm}(M_\Delta(n))$. Given $\lambda \in M_\Delta(n)$, denote its equivalence class in $\mathrm{Symm}(M_\Delta(n))/G$ by $[\lambda]$.

Let $C$ be a quasi-homogeneous curve determined by $f=0$, where $f$ is a reduced polynomial. Then Lemma 3.3 says that $f$ can be (uniquely) written in the form

$$f(x,y)=x^m y^k\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y^p-\lambda_j x^q)$$

where $m,k\in\mathbb{Z}_2$, $p,q\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, $p\leq q$, $\gcd(p,q)=1$, and $\lambda_j\in\mathbb{C}^*$ are pairwise distinct. In particular $C$ has $n+m+k$ distinct branches. Since the exceptional divisor of the standard resolution and the number of irreducible components are analytic invariants of a germ of curve, then Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 ensure that the triple $(p,q,n)$ is an analytic invariant of the curve. Thus we have to consider the following three distinct cases:

i) $f(x,y)=x^m\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y-\lambda_j x)$ where $m\in\mathbb{Z}_2$, and $\lambda_j\in\mathbb{C}$.

ii) $f(x,y)=x^m\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y-\lambda_j x^q)$ where $m\in\mathbb{Z}_2$, $q\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, $q\geq 2$ and $\lambda_j\in\mathbb{C}$.

iii) $f(x,y)=x^m y^k\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y^p-\lambda_j x^q)$ where $m,k\in\mathbb{Z}_2$, $p,q\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, $2\leq p<q$, $\gcd(p,q)=1$, and $\lambda_j\in\mathbb{C}^*$.

A quasi-homogeneous curve is said to be of *type* $(1,1,n)$, $(1,q,n)$, and $(p,q,n)$ respectively in cases i), ii), and iii).

**Theorem A** *The analytic moduli space of germs of quasi-homogeneous curves of type $(p,q,n)$ are given respectively by*

i) $\frac{\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{P}^1_\Delta(n))}{\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})}$ *if* $(p,q)=(1,1)$;

ii) $\mathbb{Z}_2\times\frac{\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}_\Delta(n))}{\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbb{C})}$ *if* $p=1$ *and* $q>1$;

iii) $\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2\times\frac{\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(n))}{\mathrm{GL}(1,\mathbb{C})}$ *if* $1<p<q$.

## 3. Quasi-homogeneous polynomials

3.1. **Normal forms.** A quasi-homogeneous polynomial $f\in\mathbb{C}[x,y]$ is called *commode* if its Newton polygon intersects both coordinate axis. Further, notice that a polynomial in two variables $P\in\mathbb{C}[x,y]$ may be considered as a polynomial in the variable $y$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}[x]$, i.e. $P\in(\mathbb{C}[x])[y]$. Let $\mathrm{ord}_y P$ be the order of $P$ as a polynomial in $(\mathbb{C}[x])[y]$. Similarly let $\mathrm{ord}_x P$ be the order of $P$ as an element of $(\mathbb{C}[y])[x]$. Therefore, a quasi-homogeneous polynomial $P\in\mathbb{C}[x,y]$ is commode if and only if $\mathrm{ord}_x P=\mathrm{ord}_y P=0$. Next, we recall the general behavior of a quasi-homogeneous polynomial.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $P\in\mathbb{C}[x,y]$ be a quasi-homogeneous polynomial, then it has a unique decomposition in the form*

$$P(x,y)=x^m y^n P_0(x,y)$$

*where $m,n\in\mathbb{N}$, $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$, and $P_0$ is a commode quasi-homogeneous polynomial.*

*Proof.* Let $m:=\mathrm{ord}_x P$ and $n:=\mathrm{ord}_y P$. Clearly, both $x^m$ and $y^n$ divide $P$. Hence $P$ can be written in the form $P(x,y)=\sum_{ai+bj=d}a_{ij}x^i y^j$ where $i\geq m$ and $j\geq n$. Thus $P(x,y)=x^m y^n P_0(x,y)$ where $P_0(x,y)=\sum_{ai'+bj'=d'}a_{i'+m,j'+n}x^{i'}y^{j'}$ and $d':=d-am-bn$. Since $m=\mathrm{ord}_x P$ and $n=\mathrm{ord}_y P$, then $\mathrm{ord}_x P_0=0=\mathrm{ord}_y P_0$. The result then follows directly from the above remark. □

**Definition 3.1.** *A commode polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ is called monic in $y$ if it is a monic polynomial in $(\mathbb{C}[x])[y]$.*

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $P \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ be a commode quasi-homogeneous polynomial, which is monic in $y$. Then $P$ can be written uniquely as*

$$P(x,y) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{k}(y^p - \lambda_\ell x^q),$$

*where* $\gcd(p,q) = 1$ *and* $\lambda_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^*$.

*Proof.* First remark that any quasi-homogeneous polynomial can be written in the form $P(x,y) = \sum_{pi+qj=m} a_{ij}x^i y^j$ where $p,q,m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gcd(p,q) = 1$. Since $P$ is commode, there are $i_0, j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $qj_0 = m$ and $pi_0 = m$; in particular $k := m/pq \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $pi + qj = pqk$. Since $\gcd(p,q) = 1$, then $q$ divides $i$ and $p$ divides $j$. If we let $i = qi'$ and $j = pj'$, then $pqi' + qpj' = pqk$. Thus $P$ can be written in the form $P(x,y) = \sum_{i+j=k} a_{qi,pj}x^{qi}y^{pj}$. Let $y = tx^{\frac{q}{p}}$, then the above equation assumes the form $P(x, tx^{q/p}) = x^{qk}\sum_{i+j=k} a_{qi,pj}t^{pj}$. Now let $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^k$ be the roots of the polynomial $g(z) = \sum_{i+j=k} a_{qi,pj}z^j$, then

$$\begin{aligned} P(x,y) &= x^{qk}\prod_{\ell=1}^{k}(t^p - \lambda_l) = x^{qk}\prod_{\ell=1}^{k}(\frac{y^p}{x^q} - \lambda_l) \\ &= \prod_{\ell=1}^{k}(y^p - \lambda_l x^q). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let $P \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ be a quasi-homogeneous polynomial. Then $P$ can be written, uniquely, in the form*

$$P(x,y) = \mu x^m y^n \prod_{\ell=1}^{k}(y^p - \lambda_\ell x^q)$$

*where $m,n,p,q \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu, \lambda_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^*$, and $\gcd(p,q) = 1$.*

*Proof.* In view of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, it is enough to remark that any commode quasi-homogeneous polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ can be written uniquely as $P = \mu P_0$ where $P_0$ is monic in $y$. □

3.2. **Resolution.** We recall the geometry of the exceptional divisor of the minimal resolution of a germ of quasi-homogeneous curve.

A *tree of projective lines* is an embedding of a connected and simply connected chain of projective lines intersecting transversely in a complex surface (two dimensional complex analytic manifold) with two projective lines in each intersection. In fact, it consists of a pasting of Hopf bundles whose zero sections are the projective lines themselves. A *tree of points* is any tree of projective lines in which a finite number of points is discriminated. The above nomenclature has a natural motivation. In fact, as is well know, we can assign to each projective line a point and to each intersection an edge in other to form the *weighted dual graph*. Two trees of points are called *isomorphic* if their weighted dual graph are isomorphic (as graphs). It is well known that any germ of analytic curve $C$ in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ has a standard resolution, which we denote by $\widetilde{C}$. If the exceptional divisor of $\widetilde{C}$ has just one projective line containing three or more singular points of $\widetilde{C}$, then it is called the *principal projective line* of $\widetilde{C}$ and denoted by $D_{\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{C})}$. A tree of projective lines is called a *linear chain* if each of its projective lines intersects at most other two projective lines of the tree. A projective line of a linear chain is called an *end* if it intersects just another one projective line of the chain.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let $C$ be a commode quasi-homogeneous curve. Then its standard resolution tree is a linear chain and its standard resolution $\widetilde{C}$ intersects just one projective line of $D$, i.e. $C$ has one of the following diagrams of resolution:*




*Proof.* From Lemma 3.2, there is a local system of coordinates $(x, y)$ such that $C = f^{-1}(0)$ where $f(x, y) = \prod_{l=1}^{k}(y^p - \lambda_j x^q)$ with $p < q$ and $\gcd(p, q) = 1$. Since each irreducible curve $y^p - \lambda_l x^q = 0$ is a generic fiber of the fibration $\frac{y^p}{x^q} \equiv \text{const}$, then it is resolved together with the fibration. After one blowup we obtain:

$$t^p/x^{q-p} \equiv \text{const},$$
$$u^q y^{q-p} \equiv \text{const}\,.$$

Since $p < q$, we have a singularity with holomorphic first integral at infinity and a meromorphic first integral at the origin (as before). Going on with this process, Euclid's algorithm assures that the resolution ends after the blowup of a radial foliation. In particular, if $p = 1$, then it is easy to see that the principal projective line is transversal to just one projective line of the divisor. Otherwise (i.e. if $p \neq 1$) the singularity with meromorphic first integral "moves" to the "infinity", i.e. it will appear in a corner singularity. Then the principal projective line intersects exactly two projective lines of the divisor. □

Let $\#\operatorname{irred}(\widetilde{C})$ denote the number of irreducible components of $\widetilde{C}$.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let $C$ be a non-commode quasi-homogeneous curve. Then its minimal resolution tree is a linear chain having a principal projective line such that $\#(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap D_{\operatorname{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}})}) \leq \#\operatorname{irred}(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}) - 1$. Further $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}} \cap D_j = \emptyset$ whenever $D_j$ is neither the principal projective line nor an end; i.e. $\mathcal{C}$ has one of the following diagrams of resolution:*




*Proof.* From Lemma 3.3, there is a local system of coordinates $(x, y)$ such that $\mathcal{C} = f^{-1}(0)$ where $f(x, y) = \mu x^m y^n \prod_{l=1}^{k}(y^p - \lambda_j x^q)$, $p < q$, and $\gcd(p, q) = 1$. Since $\mu x^m y^n$ is resolved after one blowup, then $f(x, y)$ is resolved together with the fibration $\frac{y^p}{x^q} \equiv \text{const}$, as before. Then the result follows from Lemma 3.4. □

## 4. Quasi-homogeneous curves

We consider each case separately and prove Theorem A in a series of lemmas.

4.1. **Curves of type** $(1,1,n)$**.** In this case the curve is given as the zero set of a polynomial of the form $f(x,y) = x^m\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y-\lambda_j x)$ where $m \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}$; in particular it is resolved after one blowup. Thus, given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{P}^1_\Delta(n)$ we define $f_\lambda(x,y) = x\prod_{j\neq i}(y-\lambda_j x)$ if $\lambda_i = \infty$ or $f_\lambda(x,y) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(y-\lambda_j x)$ if $\lambda_j \neq \infty$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$. We denote the curve $f_\lambda = 0$ by $C_\lambda$. Recall that the natural action of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ in $\mathbb{P}^1$ as the group of homographies induces a natural action of $\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ in $\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{P}^1_\Delta(n))$. Further, recall that the equivalence class of $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1_\Delta(n)$ in $\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{P}^1_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ is denoted by $[\lambda]$.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Two homogeneous curves $C_\lambda$ and $C_\mu$ are analytically equivalent if and only if $[\lambda] = [\mu] \in \mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{P}^1_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $C_\lambda$ and $C_\mu$ are analytically equivalent and let $\Phi \in Dif(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$ take $C_\lambda$ into $C_\mu$. Let $\widetilde{\Phi}$ be the blowup of $\Phi$, then it takes the strict transform of $C_\lambda$ into the strict transform of $C_\mu$. Blowing up $f_\lambda$ and $f_\mu$ we obtain at once that the first tangent cones of $C_\lambda$ and $C_\mu$ are respectively given by $\{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n\}$ and $\{\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_n\}$. Therefore, there is $\sigma \in S_n$ such that the Möbius transformation $\varphi = \widetilde{\Phi}\Big|_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ satisfies $\mu_{\sigma(j)} = \varphi(\lambda_j)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. In other words $[\lambda] = [\mu]$. Conversely, suppose $[\lambda] = [\mu]$. Reordering the indexes of $\{\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_n\}$ we may suppose, without loss of generality, that there is a Möbius transformation $\varphi(z) = \frac{az+b}{cz+d}$, with $ad - bc = 1$, such that $\mu_j = \varphi(\lambda_j)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Now consider the linear transformation $T(x,y) = (dx+cy, bx+ay)$ with inverse $T^{-1}(x,y) = (ax-cy, -bx+dy)$. Then a straightforward calculation shows that $f_\lambda = \alpha \cdot T^* f_\mu$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Thus $C_\lambda$ is analytically equivalent to $C_\mu$, as desired. □

**Remark 4.1.** *Recall that for any three distinct points $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\} \subset \mathbb{P}^1$ there is a Möbius transformation $\varphi$ such that $\varphi(0) = \lambda_1$, $\varphi(1) = \lambda_2$ and $\varphi(\infty) = \lambda_3$.*

As a straightforward consequence of Lemma 4.1 and Remark 4.1 one has:

**Corollary 4.1.** *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{P}^1_\Delta(n)$ with $n \leq 3$. Then $C_\lambda$ and $C_\mu$ are analytically equivalent.*

4.2. **Curves of type** $(1,q,n)$**,** $q \geq 2$**.** In this case, the curve is given as the zero set of a polynomial of the form $f_{m,\lambda}(x,y) = x^m\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y-\lambda_j x^q)$ where $m \in \mathbb{Z}_2$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $q \geq 2$, and $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus given $m \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{C}_\Delta(n)$, we denote a curve of type $(1,q,n)$ by $C_{m,\lambda}$ if it is given as the zero set of $f_{m,\lambda}$. Recall that the group of affine transformations of $\mathbb{C}$, denoted by $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbb{C})$, acts in a natural way in $\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}_\Delta(n))$. Further, recall that the equivalence class of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_\Delta(n)$ in $\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbb{C})$ is denoted by $[\lambda]$.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Two homogeneous curves $C_{m,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,\mu}$ are analytically equivalent if and only if $[\lambda] = [\mu] \in \mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbb{C})$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $\Phi \in Diff(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$ is an equivalence between $C_{m,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,\mu}$. From the proof of Lemma 3.4, both curves are resolved after $q$ blowups. Further, after $q-1$ blowups $\Phi$ will be lifted to a local conjugacy $\Phi^{(q-1)}$ between the germs of curves given in local coordinates $(x,y)$ respectively by $p_\lambda(x,y) = x\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y-\lambda_j x)$ and $p_\mu(x,y) = x\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y-\mu_j x)$ where $(x=0)$ is the local equation of the exceptional divisor $D^{(q-1)}$. Let $\pi$ denote a further blowup given in local coordinates by $\pi(t,x) = (x,tx)$ and $\pi(u,y) = (u,uy)$, and $\Phi^{(q)}$ be the map obtained by the lifting

of $\Phi^{(q-1)}$ by $\pi$. Further, let $\varphi = \Phi^{(q)}\big|_{D_q}$ where $D_q = \pi^{-1}(0)$. Since $\Phi^{(q)}$ preserves the irreducible components of $\pi^*(D^{(q-1)})$, then $\varphi(t) = \Phi^{(q)}(t,0)$ is a homography fixing $\infty$ and conjugating the first tangent cones of $p_\lambda = 0$ and $p_\mu = 0$ respectively. Thus $[\lambda] = [\mu] \in \mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{Aff}(\mathbb{C})$. Conversely, (reordering the indexes of $\mu$, if necessary) suppose there is $\varphi(z) = az + b \in \mathrm{Aff}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\mu_j = \varphi(\lambda_j)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and let $T(x,y) = (x, ay + bx^q)$. Then a straightforward calculation shows that $f_{m,\lambda} = \alpha \cdot T^* f_{m,\mu}$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Thus $C_{m,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,\mu}$ are analytically equivalent, as desired. □

As a straightforward consequence of Lemma 4.2 and Remark 4.1 one has:

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}_\Delta(n)$ with $n \leq 2$. Then $C_{m,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,\mu}$ are analytically equivalent.*

4.3. **Curves of type $(p,q,n)$, $2 \leq p < q$.** In this case, the curve is given as the zero set of a polynomial of the form $f_{m,k,\lambda}(x,y) = x^m y^k \prod_{j=1}^{n}(y^p - \lambda_j x^q)$ where $m, k = 0, 1$, $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $2 \leq p < q$, and $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Thus given $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(n)$ we denote a curve of type $(p,q,n)$ by $C_{m,k,\lambda}$ if it is given as the zero set of $f_{m,k,\lambda}(x,y)$. Recall that the group of linear transformations of $\mathbb{C}$, denoted by $\mathrm{GL}(1,\mathbb{C})$, acts in a natural way in $\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(n))$. Further, recall that the equivalence class of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(n)$ in $\mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{GL}(1,\mathbb{C})$ is denoted by $[\lambda]$.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Two homogeneous curves $C_{m,k,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,k,\mu}$ are analytically equivalent if and only if $[\lambda] = [\mu] \in \mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{GL}(1,\mathbb{C})$.*

*Proof.* First recall from the proof of Lemma 3.4 that $C_{m,k,\lambda}$ is resolved after $N$ blowups, where $N$ depends on the Euclid's division algorithm between $q$ and $p$. Further, in the $(N-1)^{th}$ step we have to blowup a singularity given in local coordinates $(x,y)$ as the zero set of the polynomial $g_\lambda(x,y) = xy\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y - \lambda_j x)$. Therefore, if $\Phi \in Diff(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ is an equivalence between $C_{m,k,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,k,\mu}$ and $\Phi^{(N-1)}$ is its lifting to the $(N-1)^{th}$ step of the resolution, then it conjugates the germs of curves given in local coordinates $(x,y)$ respectively by $p_\lambda(x,y) = xy\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y - \lambda_j x)$ and $p_\mu(x,y) = xy\prod_{j=1}^{n}(y - \mu_j x)$ where $(x=0)$ and $(y=0)$ are local equations for the exceptional divisor $D^{(N-1)}$. Let $\pi$ denote the final blowup of the resolution given in local coordinates by $\pi(t,x) = (x, tx)$ and $\pi(u,y) = (u, uy)$, and $\Phi^{(N)}$ be the map obtained by the lifting of $\Phi^{(N-1)}$ by $\pi$. Further let $\varphi = \Phi^{(N)}\big|_{D_N}$ where $D_N = \pi^{-1}(0)$. Since $\Phi^{(N)}$ preserves the irreducible components of $\pi^*(D^{(q-1)})$, then $\varphi(t) = \Phi^{(q)}(t,0)$ is a homography fixing 0 and $\infty$, and conjugating the first tangent cones of $p_\lambda = 0$ and $p_\mu = 0$ respectively. Thus $[\lambda] = [\mu] \in \mathrm{Symm}(\mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(n))/\mathrm{GL}(1,\mathbb{C})$. Conversely, (reordering the indexes of $\mu$, if necessary) suppose there is $\varphi(z) = az \in \mathrm{GL}(1,\mathbb{C})$ such that $\mu_j = \varphi(\lambda_j)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$, and let $T(x,y) = (x, \sqrt[p]{a}y)$. Then a straightforward calculation shows that $f_{m,\lambda} = \alpha \cdot T^* f_{m,\mu}$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Thus $C_{m,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,\mu}$ are analytically equivalent, as desired. □

As a straightforward consequence of Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.1 one has:

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}^*_\Delta(1)$, then $C_{m,k,\lambda}$ and $C_{m,k,\mu}$ are analytically equivalent.*

## 5. Resolution and factorization

We study the relationship between the resolution tree and the factorization of a quasi-homogeneous polynomial. We use the resolution in order to study the equivalence between two quasi-homogeneous polynomials.

First recall that a quasi-homogeneous polynomial split uniquely in the form $P = x^m y^n P_0$ where $P_0$ is a commode quasi-homogeneous polynomial. In particular $P$ and $P_0$ share the same resolution process.

**Corollary 5.1.** *Let $P \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ be a commode quasi-homogeneous polynomial with the weights $(p,q)$, where $\gcd(p,q) = 1$. Let $q_j = s_j p_j + r_j$, $j = 1,\dots,m$, be the Euclid's algorithm of $(p,q)$, where $q_1 := q$, $p_1 := p$, $q_{j+1} := p_j$, and $p_{j+1} := r_j$ for all $j = 1,\dots,m-1$. Then the exceptional divisor of its minimal resolution is given by a linear chain of projective lines, namely $D = \cup_{j=1}^n D_j$, whose self-intersection numbers are given as follows:*

(1) *If $m = 2\alpha - 1$, then*

$$D_j \cdot D_j = \begin{cases} -(s_{2k}+2) & \text{if } j = s_1 + \cdots + s_{2k-1},\ k = 1,\dots,\alpha-1; \\ -1 & \text{if } j = s_1 + \cdots + s_{2\alpha-1}; \\ -(s_{2k+1}+2) & \text{if } j = m - (s_2 + \cdots + s_{2k-2}) + 1,\ k = 1,\dots,\alpha-1; \\ -(s_{2\alpha-1}+1) & \text{if } j = m - (s_1 + \cdots + s_{2\alpha-2}) + 1; \\ -2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2) *If $m = 2\alpha$, then*

$$D_j \cdot D_j = \begin{cases} -(s_{2k}+2) & \text{if } j = s_1 + \cdots + s_{2k-1},\ k = 1,\dots,\alpha-1; \\ -(s_{2\alpha}+1) & \text{if } j = s_1 + \cdots + s_{2\alpha-1}; \\ -(s_{2k+1}+2) & \text{if } j = m - (s_2 + \cdots + s_{2k-2}) + 1,\ k = 1,\dots,\alpha-1; \\ -1 & \text{if } j = m - (s_1 + \cdots + s_{2\alpha-2}) + 1; \\ -2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Finally, if $C$ is given by $f = 0$ where $f(x,y) = x^m y^n \prod_{j=1}^k (y^p - \lambda_j x^q)$, then a representative of $[\lambda]$ is determined by the intersection of the strict transform of $C$ with the exceptional divisor $D$.*

*Proof.* The proof shall be performed by induction on $m$, the length of the Euclidean algorithm. In order to better understand the arguments, the reader have to keep in mind the proof of Lemma 3.4. From Lemma 3.2, we may suppose, without loss of generality, that $P$ can be written in the form $P(x,y) = \prod_{j=1}^k (y^p - \lambda_j x^q)$. First remark that if $m = 1$ then $p = 1$. Thus we prove the statement for $m = 1$ by induction on $q$. For $q = 1$ the result is easily verified after one blowup. Now suppose the result is true for all $q \leq q_0 - 1$. Then after one blowup $\pi(t,x) = (x, tx)$, $\pi(u,y) = (uy, y)$, $P$ is transformed into $\pi^* P(t,x) = x \prod_{j=1}^k (t - \lambda_j x^{q-1})$. Thus the result follows for $m = 1$ by induction on $q$. Suppose the result is true for all polynomials whose pair of weights have Euclid's algorithm length less than $m$, and let $(p,q)$ has length $m$. Since $p_j = s_j q_j + r_j$, $j = 1,\dots,m$, is the Euclid's algorithm of $(p,q)$, then $p_j = s_j q_j + r_j$, $j = 2,\dots,m$, is the Euclid's algorithm of $(p_2, q_2)$. In particular the Euclid's algorithm of $(p_2,q_2)$ has length $m-1$. Reasoning in a similar way as in the case $m = 1$, we have after $s_1$ blowups a linear chain of projective lines $\cup_{j=1}^{s_1} D_j^{(1)}$ such that $D_j^{(1)} \cdot D_j^{(1)} = -2$ for all $j = 1,\dots,s_1 - 1$ and $D_{s_1}^{(1)} \cdot D_{s_1}^{(1)} = -1$. Further, the strict transform of $P = 0$ is given by the zero set of the polynomial $\widetilde{P}(t,x) = \prod_{j=1}^k (t^{p_1} - \lambda_j x^{r_1}) =$

$\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k \prod_{j=1}^k (x^{p_2} - \lambda_j t^{q_2})$ where the local equation for $D_{s_1}^{(1)}$ is $(x = 0)$. The first statement thus

follows by the induction hypothesis. The last statement comes immediately from the above reasoning. For the above induction arguments ensure that the strict transform of $P$ assume the form $\widetilde{P}=0$, with $\widetilde{P}(x,y)=\prod_{j=1}^{k}(y-\lambda_j x)$, just before the last blowup. □

The above Corollary gives an easy way to compute the relatively prime weights of a quasi-homogeneous polynomials from the dual weighted tree of its minimal resolution. Also it shows that the minimal resolution can be used both to split a quasi-homogeneous polynomial into irreducible components and also to determine its analytic type.

## Part 2. Classification of foliations

### 6. Preliminaries

A germ of a singular foliation $(\mathcal{F}:\omega=0)$ in $(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$ of codimension 1 is, roughly speaking, the set of integral curves of a given germ of 1-form $\omega\in\Omega^1(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$, which may be assumed to have just an isolated singularity at the origin. Let $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^k,0)$ be the group of germs of analytic diffeomorphisms of $(\mathbb{C}^k,0)$ fixing the origin. Two germs of foliations $(\mathcal{F}_j:\omega_j=0)$ in $(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$, $j=1,2$, are analytically equivalent if there is $\Phi\in\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$ sending leaves of $\mathcal{F}_1$ into leaves of $\mathcal{F}_2$. One says that $h_1,h_2\in\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C},0)$ are analytically conjugate if there is $\phi\in\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C},0)$ such that $Ad_\phi(h_1):=\phi\circ h_1\circ\phi^{-1}=h_2$. We denote the *Hopf bundle of order k* (see Definition 7.1) by $p_{(k)}:\mathcal{H}(-k)\to D$ where $D\simeq\mathbb{CP}(1)$, or just by its total space $\mathbb{H}(-k)$. Let $\pi:(\widetilde{X},D)\longrightarrow(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$ be the map resulting from the iteration of a finite number of blowups with exceptional divisor $D=\pi^{-1}(0)$. Let $D=\cup D_j$ be its decomposition into irreducible components where $D_j$ has self-intersection number equal to $-k_j$ for $j=1,\dots,n$. Then recall from the theory of algebraic curves that a suitable neighborhood of $D$ in $\widetilde{X}$ results from pasting together suitable neighborhoods of the zero sections of $\mathbb{H}(-k_j)$. We denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ the unique extension of $\pi^*(\mathcal{F})$ whose singular set has codimension greater or equal to 2 (cf. [25]). For each Hopf bundle $p_j:\mathcal{H}_j\to D_j$ of a given resolution, we denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ the germ of a foliation in $(\mathcal{H}_j,D_j)$ induced by the restriction of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and call it the $j^{\text{th}}$ *Hopf component* of the resolution. The singular points of the exceptional divisor, namely $c_{ij}:=D_i\cap D_j$, are called *corners* and the singularities about such points are called *corner singularities* (or just corners) and denoted by $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{ij}$. The "strict transform" of $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F})$ at $D_j\subset\mathcal{H}_j$, i.e. the set of local separatrices of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$, namely $\mathrm{Sep}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j)=\overline{(\pi^*\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F}))\,|_{\mathcal{H}_j}\backslash D_j}$, is called the $j^{\text{th}}$ *Hopf component* of $\pi^*(\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F}))$. Two foliations having analytically equivalent Hopf components are called *analytically componentwise equivalent*.

Let $p:\mathcal{H}\to D$ be a Hopf bundle and $\mathcal{F}$ a germ of a foliation defined in $(\mathcal{H},D)$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is called *non-dicritical* if $D$ is an invariant set of $\mathcal{F}$, and *dicritical* otherwise. In the former case the holonomy of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to $D$ evaluated at a transversal section $\Sigma$ is called the *projective holonomy* of $\mathcal{F}$ and denoted by $\mathrm{Hol}_\Sigma(\mathcal{F},D)$. One says that $\mathcal{F}$ is *resolved* if it has just *reduced* singularities (cf. [25]). Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^1$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^2$ be two germs of non-dicritical singular foliations at $D\subset\mathcal{H}$ without saddle-nodes and having the same singular set, say $\{t_j\}_{j=1}^n$. Let $t_0\in D$ be a regular point of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^1$ and denote by $h^i_\gamma$ the holonomy of a path $\gamma\in\pi_1(D\backslash\{t_j\}_{j=1}^n,t_0)$ with respect to $D$ evaluated at a transversal section $\Sigma_0:=p^{-1}(t_0)$. Then one says that the projective holonomies of these foliations are *analytically conjugate* if there is $\phi\in\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C},0)$ such that $Ad_\phi(h^1_\gamma)=h^2_\gamma$ for every $\gamma\in\pi_1(D\backslash\{t_j\}_{j=1}^n,t_0)$.

A *generalized curve* is a germ of a singular foliation in $(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$ that has no saddle-node or dicritical components along its minimal resolution (cf. [6]). A germ of a holomorphic function $f\in\mathbb{C}\{x,y\}$ is said to be *quasi-homogeneous* if there is a local system of coordinates in which $f$

can be represented by a quasi-homogeneous polynomial, i.e. $f(x,y) = \sum_{ai+bj=d} a_{ij}x^iy^j$ where $a, b, d \in \mathbb{N}$. A quasi-homogeneous polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[x,y]$ is called *commode* if its Newton polygon intersects both coordinate axis. The separatrix set of a germ of a foliation $\mathcal{F}$ in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ is said to be quasi-homogeneous if $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F}) = f^{-1}(0)$ where $f$ is a quasi-homogeneous function. The set of generalized curves in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ with quasi-homogeneous separatrix set is denoted by $\mathcal{QHS}$; in particular, if $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F})$ is commode, then $\mathcal{F}$ is called a *commode* $\mathcal{QHS}$ foliation.

A *tree of projective lines* is an embedding of a connected and simply connected chain of projective lines intersecting transversely in a complex surface (two dimensional complex analytic manifold) with two projective lines in each intersection. In fact, it consists of the pasting of Hopf bundles whose zero sections are the projective lines themselves. A *tree of points* is any tree of projective lines in which are discriminated a finite number of points. The above nomenclature has a natural motivation. In fact, as is well know, we can assign to each projective line a point and to each intersection an edge in other to form the *weighted dual graph*. Two trees of points are called *isomorphic* if their weighted dual graph are isomorphic (as graphs).




Figure 1

Recall, from [30], that any germ of a holomorphic foliation $\mathcal{F}$ in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ has a minimal resolution. We denote it by $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and its ambient surface by $M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}}$. If the exceptional divisor of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ has just one projective line containing three or more singular points of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$, then it is called the *principal projective line* of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and denoted by $D_{\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})}$. If $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ has a principal projective line, then the projective holonomy of its principal projective line is called the *projective holonomy of the foliation* $\mathcal{F}$. Later on, we will see that any $\mathcal{QHS}$ foliation has a principal projective line. Then one says that $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}$ is *generic* if the singularities of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ about the corners of $D$ in $D_{\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})}$ are in the Poincaré-Dulac or Siegel domain (cf. [1]).

**Theorem B** *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ be two $\mathcal{QHS}$ germs of foliations with the same separatrix set. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are both commode or generic. Then $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ are analytically equivalent if and only if their projective holonomies are analytically conjugate.*

## 7. Hopf bundles and projective holonomy

We consider non-dicritical resolved singular foliations without saddle-nodes defined in a neighborhood of the zero section of a Hopf bundle. Under some natural geometric conditions, we describe the invariants that determine their analytic type.

First recall the definition of a Hopf bundle.

**Definition 7.1.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and consider two copies of $\mathbb{C}^2$ with coordinates given respectively by $(t,x)$ and $(u,y)$. Then the line bundle over $\mathbb{CP}(1)$ given by the transition maps*

$$\begin{cases} y = t^k x \\ u = 1/t \end{cases}$$

*for all $t \neq 0$ is called the Hopf bundle of order $k$ and denoted by $p_{(k)} : \mathcal{H}(-k) \to \mathbb{CP}(1)$ or just by its total space $\mathbb{H}(-k)$.*

Clearly, two analytically equivalent singularities have isomorphic weighted dual trees of singular points along their minimal resolution. Thus, if we consider analytically equivalent Hopf

components, it is clear that isomorphic points have the same linear part and that their local holonomy generators are conjugated by a global map. To clarify the ideas, we need the following

**Definition 7.2.** *Let $M$ be a complex surface and $S \subset M$ a smooth curve invariant by the germ of a holomorphic foliation $\mathcal{F}$ in $(M,S)$ such that $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{F}) \subset S$ has just non-degenerated reduced singularities (i.e. without saddle nodes). Then we say that a germ of a holomorphic map $f:(M,S)\to S$ is a fibration transversal to $\mathcal{F}$ if it satisfies:*

1. *$f$ is a retraction, i.e. $f$ is a submersion and $f|_S = \mathrm{id}\,|_S$;*
2. *the fiber $f^{-1}(t_j)$ is a separatrix of $\mathcal{F}$ for each $t_j \in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$;*
3. *$f^{-1}(t)$ is transversal to $\mathcal{F}$ for every (regular) point $t \in S\backslash \mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$.*

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a germ of a singular holomorphic foliation without saddle-nodes defined in a neighborhood of the zero section of the Hopf bundle $p:\mathcal{H}\to D$, $f:(\mathcal{H},D)\to D$ a fibration transversal to $\mathcal{F}$, and $t_0 \in D\backslash \mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$ a regular point of $\mathcal{F}$. Hence the path lifting construction ensures that the projective holonomy $\mathrm{Hol}_{f^{-1}(t)}(\mathcal{F},D)$ is completely determined by $\mathrm{Hol}_{f^{-1}(t_o)}(\mathcal{F},D)$ for any $t,t_0 \in D\backslash \mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{F})$. Such a holonomy is called the *projective holonomy* of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to $f$. If there is no doubt about the fibration, we only talk about the projective holonomy of the foliation and denote it by $\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{F},D)$.

**Definition 7.3.** *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}_o$ be germs of singular resolved and non-dicritical foliations defined in a neighborhood of the zero section of the Hopf bundle $p:\mathcal{H}\to D$ with the same singular set $S$. Then we set*

$$\mathrm{Diff}_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{F}_o}(\mathcal{H},D) := \{\Phi \in \mathrm{Diff}(\mathcal{H},D) :\ \Phi_*(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}_o \text{ and } \Phi|_S = \mathrm{id}\}$$

*and call*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}_o) := \{\Phi \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\mathcal{F}_o,\mathcal{F}_o}(\mathcal{H},D) : \Phi|_S = \mathrm{id}\}$$

*the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}_o$. Further, if $f:(\mathcal{H},D)\to D$ is a fibration transversal to $\mathcal{F}_o$, then the set of elements of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}_o)$ preserving $f$ is denoted by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}_o,f)$.*

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let $\mathcal{F}^i$, $i=1,2$, be two germs of resolved and non-dicritical singular foliations without saddle-nodes defined in a neighborhood of the zero section of the Hopf bundle $p:\mathcal{H}\to D$. Suppose that $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F}^1) = \mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F}^2)$ and that there is a fibration $f_i:(\mathcal{H},D)\longrightarrow D$ transversal to $\mathcal{F}^i$. Then $\mathcal{F}^1$ and $\mathcal{F}^2$ are analytically equivalent if and only if their projective holonomies are analytically conjugate.*

*Proof.* As already remarked, the necessary part is straightforward. Let us treat the sufficient part. Since the separatrices of $\mathcal{F}^1$ and $\mathcal{F}^2$ coincide, then their singular sets also coincide. Let $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{F}^i) = \{t_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $t_0 \in D$ be a regular point. Suppose there is $\phi \in \mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C},0)$ such that $\phi \circ (h_j^1) \circ \phi^{-1} = h_j^2$ for all $j=1,\dots,n$. Then define the map $\Phi : \mathcal{F}\backslash \bigcup_{j=1}^n f_1^{-1}(t_j) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}'\backslash \bigcup_{j=1}^n f_2^{-1}(t_j)$ by

$$\Phi(t,x) := \Phi_t(x) := h_t^2 \circ \phi \circ (h_t^1)^{-1}(x),$$

where $x \in f_1^{-1}(t)$ and $h_t^i : f_i^{-1}(t_0) \longrightarrow f_i^{-1}(t)$ are the holonomy maps obtained by path lifting a curve connecting $t_0$ to $t$ along the leaves of $\mathcal{F}^i$. Note that this map does not depend on the chosen base curves, since $\phi$ conjugates the elements of the respective projective holonomies of $\mathcal{F}^1$ and $\mathcal{F}^2$. Since $\Phi$ is holomorphic in each variable separately, then (complex) ODE theory and Hartogs' theorem ensure that $\Phi$ is holomorphic. Finally, since $\mathcal{F}^1$ has just reduced singularities, then [25],[27] ensure that the union of the saturated of $\Sigma_0 := f_1^{-1}(t_0)$ along the leaves of $\mathcal{F}^1$ and the local separatrices $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F}^1) = \bigcup_{j=1}^n f_1^{-1}(t_j)$ gives rise to a neighborhood of $D$. Thus we can use Riemann's extension theorem in order to extend $\Phi$ to $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F}^1)$ in a neighborhood of $D$. $\square$

## 8. Analytic invariants

We consider germs of foliations in $(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$ and use the weighted dual trees of their minimal resolutions, the first jet of each singularity of these resolutions, and the projective holonomies of their Hopf components in order to determine analytic componentwise equivalence. Next, we identify some analytical cocycles that appear as obstructions to extend analytically componentwise isomorphism. Finally, we relate these obstructions with the analytic classification of the foliations.

8.1. **Componentwise equivalence and realization.** We find conditions to determine whether two $\mathcal{QHS}$ foliations with the same quasi-homogeneous separatrix set are componentwise equivalent.

First, let us introduce some notation. Let $\mathcal{QHS}_f$ denote the set of $\mathcal{QHS}$ foliations with the same separatrix set $f=0$. Let $\mathcal{F},\mathcal{F}'\in\mathcal{QHS}_f$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}},\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}'$ be respectively their minimal resolutions. Let $\mathrm{Sing}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})=\{t_{i,j_i}\}_{i,j_i=1}^{k,n_i}$ where $k$ is the number of Hopf components of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $n_i:=\#\,\mathrm{Sing}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_i)$. Let $\omega_{i,j_i}=0$ and $\omega'_{i,j_i}=0$ determine the germs of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}'$ at $t_{i,j_i}$. Then one says that $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}'$ is *analytically componentwise equivalent* to $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ *up to first order* if $J^1(\omega_{i,j_i})=J^1(\omega'_{i,j_i})$ (i.e. if they have the same linear part) for all $i=1,\dots,k$ and $j_i=1,\dots,n_i$. The set of $\mathcal{QHS}_f$ foliations analytically componentwise equivalent up to first order to $(\mathcal{F}:\omega=0)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{QHS}^{c,1}_{\omega,f}$. Finally, denote the set of $\mathcal{QHS}$ (respect. $\mathcal{QHS}_f$) foliations analytically componentwise equivalent to $(\mathcal{F}:\omega=0)$ by $\mathcal{QHS}^{c}_{\omega}$ (respect. $\mathcal{QHS}^{c}_{\omega,f}$).

**Remark 8.1.** *Any element in $\mathcal{QHS}_f$ has its weighted dual graph automatically determined by the separatrix $f=0$.*

We determine now the moduli space $\mathcal{QHS}^{c,1}_{\omega}/\,\mathcal{QHS}^{c}_{\omega}$. The following result is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 7.1.

**Proposition 8.1.** *Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ belong with the same conjugacy class in $\mathcal{QHS}^{c,1}_{\omega}$. Then they belong with the same conjugacy class in $\mathcal{QHS}^{c}_{\omega}$ if and only if their projective holonomies are analytically conjugate.*

Given two germs of foliations in $\mathcal{QHS}^{c}_{\omega}$, we want to verify under what conditions they are in fact globally holomorphically conjugate. For this sake, we need the following realization data.

**Definition 8.1.** *A complex surface is called resolution-like if it is obtained by a holomorphic pasting of Hopf bundles with negative Chern classes, in such a way that the union of their zero sections become a tree of projective lines isomorphic to the exceptional divisor of a composition of a finite numbers of blowups applied to $(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$.*

Clearly, this definition is given in such a way that every resolution surface of some singularity is automatically resolution-like. In fact, any resolution-like surface is biholomorphic to the resolution surface of some singularity.

**Proposition 8.2** ([12])**.** *Let $M$ be a resolution-like surface with tree of projective lines $D$. Then $(M,D)$ can be realized as a neighborhood of the exceptional divisor of a composition of a finite number of blowups applied to $(\mathbb{C}^2,0)$.*

In order to prove this proposition, we need the following results about complex line bundles.

**Theorem 8.1** (Grauert [18])**.** *Let $S$ be a complex surface and $C\subset S$ be a rational curve with negative self-intersection number. Then there are neighborhoods $U$ and $V$ of $C$, respectively in $S$ and $N(C;S)$ (the normal bundle of $C$ in $S$), and a biholomorphism $\Psi:U\to V$ sending $C$ in the zero section of $N(C;S)$.*

**Theorem 8.2** (Grothendieck [19])**.** *Two complex line bundles over the Riemann sphere have the same Chern class if and only if they are biholomorphic.*

*Proof of Proposition 8.2.* The proof is performed by induction on the number of projective lines in the chain. If the chain is composed by just one projective line, the result follows immediately from the theorems of Grauert and Grothendieck. Suppose the result is true for all chains composed by $n \geq 1$ projective lines and let $D_j$ have $n+1$ projective lines. From the hypothesis, $D_j$ has two intersecting projective lines, namely $C_j^1$ and $C_j^2$, with self-intersection numbers given respectively by $-1$ and $-2$. Hence, applying Grauert's and Grothendieck's theorems, we obtain that a neighborhood of each curve is biholomorphic to a neighborhood of the zero section of the Hopf bundle with Chern classes given by their self-intersection numbers. Thus we can blow down a neighborhood of the curve $C_j^1$ obtaining yet an analytic surface defined in a neighborhood of a Riemann sphere, say $\pi(C_j^2)$ — where $\pi$ stands for the blow down. Since $\pi(C_j^2)$ is smooth, it is well known that its self-intersection number is $-1$ (cf. e.g. [22]). The result now follows from the induction hypothesis. □

**Remark 8.2.** *Although two foliations in $\mathcal{QHS}_\omega^c$ are not necessarily defined in the same ambient surface, they all can be modeled by $(\mathcal{F} : \omega = 0)$ in the sense that they are analytically componentwise equivalent to $\mathcal{F}$. Anyway, the ambient surface will be automatically equivalent whenever they have equivalent cocycles (definition found below).*

8.2. **Analytic cocycles.** We construct some cocycles associated with analytically componentwise equivalent foliations. In some sense, these cocycles measure how far two analytically componentwise equivalent foliations are from being analytically equivalent.

Let $\mathcal{F}^o \in \mathcal{QHS}$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$ its minimal resolution, and $M^o = M_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o}$ the ambient surface where $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$ is defined. Let $\mathrm{Pseudo}(M^o)$ denote the pseudogroup of transformations of $M^o$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o)$ denote its subset given by those $\phi \in \mathrm{Pseudo}(M^o)$ satisfying the following properties:

(a) $\phi : U \longrightarrow \phi(U)$ preserves the Hopf components of the exceptional divisor, i.e. $\phi(U \cap D_j) = \phi(U) \cap D_j$;
(b) $\phi$ fixes the singularities of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$, i.e. $\phi|_{\mathrm{Sing}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o)} = \mathrm{id}|_{\mathrm{Sing}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o)}$;
(c) $\phi$ preserves the leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o$, i.e. $\phi^*(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o\Big|_{\phi(U)}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o\Big|_U$.

At this point, some comments about the above definition are worthwhile. First, notice that all conditions can be verified explicitly. The first two are quite obvious and the third can be achieved with the aid of the path lifting procedure. In fact, choose a section $\Sigma$ transversal to $D_j$ and pick an element $\psi : \phi(\Sigma) \longrightarrow \Sigma$ of the classical holonomy pseudogroup of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o\Big|_U$ with respect to $D_j$. Since the holonomy characterizes $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o\Big|_U$ (cf. Proposition 7.1, [25], [27]), it is enough to verify that $\psi \circ \phi \in \mathrm{Diff}(\Sigma)$ commutes with the generators of $\mathrm{Hol}_\Sigma(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o\Big|_U, D_j)$. Further, note that we decided to deal with just local and semilocal leaves (i.e. those determined by the holonomies of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o\Big|_U$) avoiding, for the time been, questions related with Dulac maps (cf. [10], [11]) that are very difficult to handle concretely in the global sense. This task will be performed by the pasting cocycles we define next.

**Definition 8.2.** *Let $(\mathcal{F} : \omega = 0)$ be a germ of a foliation in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. Then the set*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\phi \in \mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^2, 0) : \phi^*\omega \wedge \omega = 0\}$$

*is called the group of automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}$. Further, if $f : (M, S) \to S$ is a fibration transversal to $\mathcal{F}$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}, f)$ denote the subgroup determined by elements of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F})$ preserving $f$.*

Let $(\mathcal{F}:\omega=0)$ be a generalized curve and pick $\mathcal{F}^o$ analytically componentwise equivalent to $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathrm{Sep}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o)$ consists of fibers of a fibration $f_j:(\mathcal{H}_j,D_j)\longrightarrow D_j$ transversal to $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o$ (such a resolution exists from [12]). Then $\mathcal{F}^o$ is called a *fixed model* for $\mathcal{F}$ and a map $\Phi_j\in\mathrm{Diff}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o)$ is called a *projective chart* for $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with respect to $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$. From we have done before, it is straightforward that:

**Lemma 8.1.** *For each $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j=\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}\Big|_{(\mathcal{H}_j,D_j)}$ and each fixed model component $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o$, there exists only one projective chart up to left composition with an element of $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o)$.*

Let $D=\cup D_j$ be the exceptional divisor of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$. One says that $\mathcal{U}:=\cup U_j$ is a *good covering* for $D$ if each $U_j$ is a simply-connected neighborhood of $D_j\subset\mathcal{H}_j$ and each intersections $U_i\cap U_j$ is simply-connected. For each good covering $\mathcal{U}$ and each foliation $\mathcal{F}$ one can associate a cocycle $\Phi(\mathcal{F}):=(\Phi_{i,j})$ given by $\Phi_{i,j}:=\Phi_i\circ\Phi_j^{-1}$ where each $\Phi_i$ is a projective chart for $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with respect to $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$. Note that $(\Phi_{i,j})$ does not depend neither on the fixed models nor on the chosen (good) covering up to analytically componentwise equivalence class.

**Proposition 8.3.** *Two analytically componentwise equivalent generalized curves $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are analytically equivalent if and only if $\Phi(\mathcal{F})=\Phi(\mathcal{G})$.*

*Proof.* Let $\Phi(\mathcal{F})=(\Phi_1\circ\Phi_2^{-1},\cdots,\Phi_{k-1}\circ\Phi_k^{-1})$ and $\Phi(\mathcal{G})=(\Psi_1\circ\Psi_2^{-1},\cdots,\Psi_{k-1}\circ\Psi_k^{-1})$. First, let us verify the necessary part. Suppose $H$ is a global conjugation between $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, i.e. $H^*(\mathcal{G})=\mathcal{F}$. From Lemma 8.1, there is $\Xi_j\in\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o)$ such that $\Psi_j=\Xi_j\circ\Phi_j\circ H$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{j-1}\circ\Psi_j^{-1}&=\Xi_{j-1}\circ\Phi_{j-1}\circ H\circ H^{-1}\circ\Phi_j^{-1}\circ\Xi_j^{-1}\\&=\Xi_{j-1}\circ\Phi_{j-1}\circ\Phi_j^{-1}\circ\Xi_j^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Now let us verify the sufficient part. Notice that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ have the same fixed model. Hence, if $(\Phi_1\circ\Phi_2^{-1},\cdots,\Phi_{k-1}\circ\Phi_k^{-1})=\Phi(\mathcal{F})=\Phi(\mathcal{G})=(\Psi_1\circ\Psi_2^{-1},\cdots,\Psi_{k-1}\circ\Psi_k^{-1})$, there is a collection $(\Xi_j)\subset\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o)$ such that $\Psi_{j-1}\circ\Psi_j^{-1}=\Xi_{j-1}\circ\Phi_{j-1}\circ\Phi_j^{-1}\circ\Xi_j^{-1}$. Therefore $(\Xi_{j-1}\circ\Phi_{j-1})^{-1}\circ\Psi_{j-1}=(\Xi_j\circ\Phi_j)^{-1}\circ\Psi_j$. Thus we can define a global conjugation between them just by letting $H:=(\Xi_j\circ\Phi_j)^{-1}\circ\Psi_j$ for all $j=1,\ldots,k$. □

**Remark 8.3.** *It is not difficult to verify that $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o)$ is itself a pseudogroup of transformations of $M^o$. Therefore the sheaf of germs of elements of $\mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o)$, generated by inductive limit, is a sheaf of groupoids over the exceptional divisor $D^o$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$ (cf.* [20]*). We denote this sheaf by $\mathfrak{Aut}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o}$. Consider the first cohomology set $H^1(\mathcal{U},\mathfrak{Aut}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o})$, and let $H^1(D,\mathfrak{Aut}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o})$ be the inductive limit of $H^1(\mathcal{U},\mathrm{Aut}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o})$ for all good coverings of $D$. Then Proposition 8.2 ensures that the map*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\mathcal{QHS}_\omega^c&\xrightarrow{\Phi}&Z^1(D,\mathrm{Aut}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o})\\\mathcal{F}&\mapsto&(\Phi_{i,j}:=\Phi_i\circ\Phi_j^{-1})\end{array}$$

*is well defined and onto $H^1(D,\mathrm{Aut}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o})$. Since $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$ does not depend on the fixed models up to componentwise equivalence class, it determines a characteristic class for generalized curves appearing as obstruction for the global pasting of analytically componentwise isomorphisms. For the reader not acquainted with groupoids and the cohomology of their sheaves, we refer to* [14], [15] *and* [20].

## 9. Trivializing cocycles

We use the algebraic and geometric features of the separatrix set in order to construct an auxiliary fibration that helps us to trivialize the cocycles. For this sake, we have first to introduce the concept of leaf preserving automorphism. Further, we use the geometry of the divisors of both the foliation and the fibration in order to provide a method for trivializing $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$.

9.1. **Quasi-homogeneous polynomials and companion fibrations.** In order to prove Theorem B, we need to perform an accurate geometric analysis of the interplay between the foliation $\mathcal{F}$ and its companion fibration $\mathcal{G}$.

9.1.1. *Multivalued first integrals and the branches of $\mathcal{F}$.* Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega,f}$ where

$$f(x,y) = \mu y^m x^n \prod_{j=1}^{d} (y^p - \lambda_j x^q), \tag{9.1}$$

$1 \leq p < q, m, n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\gcd(p,q) = 1$, and $\lambda_j, \mu \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Then we order the first projective line to arise in the course of the resolution process with 1, the next one intersecting it with 2, and so on (see Lemma 3.4 and Figure 7), until we reach the last projective line in the minimal resolution. Recall that the principal projective line is denoted by $D_{\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})}$ or $D_\ell$ where $\ell = \mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})$. For the sake of simplicity we call the subset of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ given by $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F} := \cup_{j>\ell}\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ (respect. $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F} := \cup_{j<\ell}\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$) the *positive* (respect. *negative*) *branch* of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$. We are in a position to state the following geometric characterization of the branches of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$.




Figure 7: The principal projective line for $p \neq 1$.

**Lemma 9.1.** *$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ is linearizable for each $j \neq \mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})$. In particular, it has a multivalued first integral. More precisely, there is $\Phi_j \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^{lin}}(\mathcal{H}_j, D_j)$ where $(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^{lin} : d\widetilde{f}_j^{lin} = 0)$ is given by the (global) multivalued first integral*

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{f}_j^{lin}(t_j, x_j) = t_j^{\nu_j} x_j^{\mu_j}, \\ \widetilde{f}_j^{lin}(u_j, y_j) = u_j^{k_j\mu_j - \nu_j} y_j^{\mu_j}, \end{cases}$$

*where $\nu_j, \mu_j \in \mathbb{C}$ are non-resonant and $-k_j$ is the first Chern class of $\mathbb{H}_j$ for all $j \neq \ell$.*

*Proof.* Since $\mathcal{F}$ is generic, then the corner singularities of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})}$ are linearizable (cf. [32]). But Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 ensure that $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ has at most two singularities for all $j \neq \mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})$, thus both singularities share the same holonomy with respect to $D_j$. Recall from [25] that a reduced and non-degenerate (i.e. a non saddle-node) singularity is linearizable if and only if its holonomy is linearizable. Thus Proposition 7.1 ensures that $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ is linearizable whenever one of its singularities is linearizable. □

Let $(x,y)$ be the system of coordinates about the origin in which $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F})$ assumes the form (9.1), then it induces canonical affine coordinates for $M := \cup_{j=1}^n \mathbb{H}_j(-k_j)$, denoted by

$$\mathcal{A} := \{(t_j, x_j), (u_j, y_j) : u_j = 1/t_j, y_j = t_j^{k_j} x_j, y_j = t_{j+1}, u_j = x_{j+1}\}. \tag{9.2}$$

Now we prove that $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ (respect. $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$) has a multivalued first integral and describe its feature in this system of coordinates. But first recall that $\mathbb{D}_r$ denotes the disk centered at the origin with radius $r$.

**Lemma 9.2.** *$\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ (respect. $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$) has a multivalued first integral denoted by $\widetilde{f}_+$ (respect. $\widetilde{f}_-$). More precisely, $\widetilde{f}_+$ (respect. $\widetilde{f}_-$) is given in the system of coordinates $\mathcal{A}$ by $\widetilde{f}_+ = \widetilde{f}_j$ where*

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{f}_j(t_j, x_j) = t_j^{\nu_j} x_j^{\mu_j} U_j(t_j, x_j), \\ \widetilde{f}_j(u_j, y_j) = u_j^{k_j\mu_j - \nu_j} y_j^{\mu_j} V_j(u_j, y_j), \end{cases}$$

*with $U_j, V_j \in \mathcal{O}^*(\mathbb{D}_\epsilon \times \mathbb{D}_{1+\epsilon})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ and all $j = 1, \ldots, \ell-1$ (respect. $j = \ell+1, \ldots, n-1$).*

*Proof.* We prove the statement for the positive branch case, the other one being completely analogous. Pick $\Phi_{\ell+1} \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+1},\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{lin}_{\ell+1}}(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1}, D_{\ell+1})$ and let $\widetilde{f}_{\ell+1} := \Phi^*_{\ell+1}\widetilde{f}^{lin}_{\ell+1}$. Let $p$ be a regular point of $D_{\ell+2}$ near the corner $c_{\ell+1,\ell+2} := D_{\ell+1} \cap D_{\ell+1}$ and $\Sigma_p$ be the fiber of $\mathbb{H}_{\ell+2}$ over $p$. Recall that $\Phi_{\ell+1}$ induces a bijective map between the spaces of leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+1}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{lin}_{\ell+1}$ which can be realized as $\phi_{\ell+2} \in \mathrm{Diff}(\Sigma_p, p)$. In particular, $\phi_{\ell+2}$ takes $\mathrm{Hol}_{\Sigma_p}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+2}, D_{\ell+2})$ in $\mathrm{Hol}_{\Sigma_p}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{lin}_{\ell+2}, D_{\ell+2})$. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+2}$ has just two singularities, then Proposition 7.1 ensures that one can extend $\phi_{\ell+2}$ to $\Phi_{\ell+2} \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+2},\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{lin}_{\ell+2}}(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+2}, D_{\ell+2})$ by classical path lifting arguments along the fibers of $\mathbb{H}_{\ell+2}$ (just use the same arguments in the proof of Lemma 9.1). Since $\Phi_{\ell+1}$ and $\Phi_{\ell+2}$ induce the same bijective map between the spaces of leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+1,\ell+2}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{lin}_{\ell+1,\ell+2}$, then $\Phi_{\ell+2} \circ \Phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}$ fixes the leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^{lin}_{\ell+1,\ell+2}$. Therefore, if we let $\widetilde{f}_{\ell+2} := \Phi^*_{\ell+2}\widetilde{f}^{lin}_{\ell+2}$, then $\widetilde{f}_{\ell+2} = \widetilde{f}_{\ell+1}$ about $c_{\ell+1,\ell+2}$. Proceeding by induction on $j > \ell$ we obtain a multivalued first integral for $\mathcal{B}_+\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Finally, let us verify that $\widetilde{f}_+$ has the desired form. Since $\widetilde{f}^{lin}_j(t_j, x_j) = t_j^{\nu_j}x_j^{\mu_j}$ and $\Phi_j$ is of the form $\Phi_j(t_j, x_j) = (t_j, \alpha_j x_j + x_j a_j(t_j, x_j))$, with $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $a_j \in \mathfrak{m}_2$ (where $\mathfrak{m}_2$ denotes the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_2$), then a straightforward calculation shows that $\widetilde{f}_j(t_j, x_j) = t_j^{\nu_j}x_j^{\mu_j}U_j(t_j, x_j)$ where $U_j(t_j, x_j) = [\alpha_j + a_j(t_j, x_j)]^{\mu_j} \in \mathcal{O}^*(\mathbb{D}_\epsilon \times \mathbb{D}_{1+\epsilon})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Similarly $\widetilde{f}^{lin}_j(u_j, y_j) = u_j^{k_j\mu_j-\nu_j}y_j^{\mu_j}$ and $\Phi_j(u_j, y_j) = (u_j, \beta_j y_j + y_j b_j(u_j, y_j))$, with $\beta_j \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $b_j \in \mathfrak{m}_2$. Thus $\widetilde{f}_j(u_j, y_j) = u_j^{k_j\mu_j-\nu_j}y_j^{\mu_j}V_j(u_j, y_j)$ where $V_j(u_j, y_j) = [\beta_j + b_j(u_j, y_j)]^{\mu_j} \in \mathcal{O}^*(\mathbb{D}_\epsilon \times \mathbb{D}_{1+\epsilon})$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. □

9.1.2. *Holomorphic first integrals and the geometry of* $\mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$. The arguments used in the proof of Lemma 3.4 ensure that $\mathcal{F}$ is resolved together with any "generic" fiber of the *companion fibration* $\frac{y^p}{x^q} \equiv$ const, i.e. $(\mathcal{G} : \eta = 0)$ given by $\eta(x, y) = pxdy - qydx$. In other words, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are resolved by the same sequence of blowups. In particular, the minimal resolution of $\mathcal{G}$ has the same tree of projective lines of the minimal resolution of any element of $\mathcal{QHS}^{c,1}_{\omega,f}$ and contains its separatrices as fibers. Furthermore, for each $j \neq \mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})$ the foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j$ has a (global) holomorphic first integral of the form

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{\eta}(t_j, x_j) = d(t_j^{r_j}x_j^{s_j}), \\ \widetilde{\eta}(u_j, y_j) = d(u_j^{k_j s_j - r_j}y_j^{s_j}), \end{cases}$$

where $r_j$, $s_j \in \mathbb{N}$ are relatively prime. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})}$ is a radial fibration, then $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})-1}$ has just one singularity (cf. Figure 8).




Figure 8: The resolution tree of $\mathcal{G} : (\frac{x^p}{y^q} = const.)$

9.1.3. *Comparing the indexes of* $\mathcal{F}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$. First, recall the celebrated Camacho-Sad's index theorem. Let $S$ be a complex surface, $C \subset S$ a smooth analytic curve, and $\mathcal{F}$ a germ of a singular foliation defined in a neighborhood of $C$ with just isolated singularities. For each singular point $p$ of $\mathcal{F}$ in $S$, the Camacho-Sad's index is defined as follows: choose local coordinates for $S$ around $p$ such that $C$ is given by $(y = 0)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be given by $\omega = 0$ where $\omega(x, y) = a(x, y)dx + b(x, y)dy$. Then $CS_p(\mathcal{F}, S) = \mathrm{Res}_{x=0}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(\frac{a}{b}(x, y)\big|_{y=0})dx$. In particular, if $\omega(x, y) = \mu y(1 + \cdots)dx + \nu x(1 + \cdots)dy$ where $\mu, \nu \neq 0$, then $CS_0(\mathcal{F}, S) = \frac{\mu}{\nu}$. A straightforward calculation shows that this index does not depend on the coordinates.

**Theorem 9.1** (Camacho-Sad [5])**.** *Let $S$ be a complex surface, $C \subset M$ a smooth analytic curve, and $\mathcal{F}$ a germ of a singular foliation defined in a neighborhood of $S$ with just isolated singularities. Then*

$$\sum_{p\in \mathrm{Sing}(\mathcal{F})} CS_p(\mathcal{F}, S) = C \cdot C$$

*where $C \cdot C$ is the self-intersection number of $C$ in $S$.*

Now, comparing the Camacho-Sad's indexes of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j$ (starting from $\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}) - 1$ to 1 and from $\mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$ to $n$), then the Camacho-Sad's index theorem says that

$$\nu_j s_j - \mu_j r_j \neq 0 \text{ for all } j \neq \mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}). \tag{9.3}$$

**Remark 9.1.** *If $\mathrm{Sep}(\mathcal{F})$ is commode, then $\mathcal{F}$ is automatically generic. In fact, Lemma 3.4 ensures that any Hopf components of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ about an end of $D$ has just one singularity. Therefore, with arguments similar to that used for $\mathcal{G}$, one can verify that each Hopf component $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ has linear and periodic holonomy for all $j \neq \mathrm{pr}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})$. Thus it is linearizable and has a holomorphic first integral (cf.* [25]*).*

9.2. **Cocycles fixing the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$.** Here we show how to trivialize $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$ and prove Theorem B.

9.2.1. *Fixing leaves locally.* We introduce some notation first in order to clarify the ideas. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a germ of reduced singular foliation in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. Since it is characterized by its (local) holonomy group (cf. [25], [27]), then it is classical to identify the space of leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ with the the quotient of $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ by the action of the unique fibre preserving suspension of this holonomy in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F}, f)$. Therefore, we say that $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{F})$ fixes the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ if its action in the space of leaves of $\mathcal{F}$ is trivial. We denote the set of such automorphisms by $\mathrm{Fix}(\mathcal{F})$. As before, this condition can be verified explicitly by path lifting arguments. In particular, if $U$ is an open neighborhood of some point in the exceptional divisor of $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ (respect. $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$) and $\phi \in \mathrm{Diff}(U)$, then we say that $\phi$ fixes the leaves of $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ (respect. $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$), denoting it just by $\phi \in \mathrm{Fix}(\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F})$ (respect. $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$), if $\phi$ preserves the level sets of the first integrals introduced in Lemma 9.2.

Let $\mathcal{QHS}_\omega$ denote the set of $\mathcal{QHS}$ foliations that are analytically equivalent to $(\mathcal{F}_\omega : \omega = 0)$, and $f = 0$ be the separatrix set of $\mathcal{F}_\omega$. From the discussion in §8.2, in order to determine the moduli space $\mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega,f}/\,\mathcal{QHS}_\omega$, we have to pick a fixed model $\mathcal{F}^o \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega,f}$ and a collection of projective charts $(\Phi_j)$ for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega,f}$ (with respect to $\mathcal{F}^o$) preserving $f = 0$. In order to simplify the expression of $(\Phi_j)$, it is natural to ask it to preserve not just $f = 0$ but the whole companion fibration $\mathcal{G}$. On the other hand, it is not difficult to see that the geometry of the exceptional divisor of $\mathcal{F}$ allows to simplify inductively the transversal structure of $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$ in such a way that each $\Phi_{i,j}$ fixes (locally) the leaves of $\mathcal{F}$. This, of course, will also simplify the expression of $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$. An optimistic viewpoint suggests that one can do both at the same time simplifying a lot the expression of $\Phi(\mathcal{F})$.

9.2.2. *Projective charts and first integrals adapted to a fixed model.* In each componentwise equivalence class pick a model $(\mathcal{F}^o : \omega^o = 0)$ and fix first integrals $f^o_+$ and $f^o_-$ for $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}^o$ and $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}^o$ as in Lemma 9.2. Now, for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega^o,f}$, we shall construct first integrals for $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$ and a collection of projective charts in an appropriate way. First let us introduce some useful notation: one says that a collection of projective charts $(\Phi_j)$ for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega^o,f}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}^o$ and first integrals $f_+$ for $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ and $f_-$ for $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$ are *adapted* to $(\mathcal{F}^o, f^o_+, f^o_-)$ if each $\Phi_j$ takes $(f_+ = c)$ in $(f^o_+ = c)$ for all $j = \ell, \ldots, n$ and $\Phi_j$ takes $(f_- = c)$ in $(f^o_- = c)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$.

**Lemma 9.3.** *For each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega^o,f}$ there is a collection of projective charts $(\Phi_j)$ for $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}^o$ and first integrals $f_+$ for $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ and $f_-$ for $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$ adapted to $(\mathcal{F}^o, f^o_+, f^o_-)$.*

*Proof.* We prove the statement for the positive branch case, the other one being completely analogous. Pick $\Phi_\ell \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\ell,\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_\ell}(\mathcal{H}_\ell, D_\ell)$ and let $\widetilde{f}_{\ell,\ell+1} := \Phi_\ell^* \widetilde{f}^o_{\ell,\ell+1}$, where $\widetilde{f}^o_{\ell,\ell+1}$ is the germ of $\widetilde{f}^o_{\ell+1}$ at the corner $c_{\ell,\ell+1} := D_\ell \cap D_{\ell+1}$. Let $p$ be a regular point of $D_{\ell+1}$ near the corner $c_{\ell,\ell+1}$ and $\Sigma_p$ be the fiber of $\mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}$ over $p$. Recall that $\Phi_\ell$ induces a bijective map between the spaces of leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell,\ell+1}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell,\ell+1}$ which can be realized as $\phi_{\ell+1} \in \mathrm{Diff}(\Sigma_p, p)$. In particular, $\phi_{\ell+1}$ takes $\mathrm{Hol}_{\Sigma_p}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell,\ell+1}, D_{\ell+1})$ onto $\mathrm{Hol}_{\Sigma_p}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell,\ell+1}, D_{\ell+1})$. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+1}$ has just two singularities, then the spaces of leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell,\ell+1}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+1}$ coincide as the spaces of leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell,\ell+1}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell+1}$. Therefore Proposition 7.1 ensures that one can extend $\phi_{\ell+1}$ to $\Phi_{\ell+1} \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell+1},\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell+1}}(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1}, D_{\ell+1})$ along the fibers of $\mathbb{H}_{\ell+1}$ by classical path lifting arguments (just use the same arguments in the proof of Lemma 9.1). Since $\Phi_\ell$ and $\Phi_{\ell+1}$ induce the same bijective map between the spaces of leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\ell,\ell+1}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell,\ell+1}$, then $\Phi_\ell \circ \Phi_{\ell+1}^{-1}$ fixes the leaves of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell,\ell+1}$. Therefore, if we let $\widetilde{f}_{\ell+1} := \Phi^*_{\ell+1}\widetilde{f}^o_{\ell+1}$, then $\widetilde{f}_{\ell+1} = \widetilde{f}_{\ell,\ell+1}$ about $c_{\ell,\ell+1}$. Proceeding by induction on $j > \ell+1$ we obtain a multivalued first integral for $\mathcal{B}_+\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ and the collection of projective charts with the desired properties. □

In order to give a better understanding of the proof of the next lemma, let us make a brief digression about the simultaneous linearization of two transversal non-singular foliations. As it is well known, two germs of non-singular holomorphic foliations $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ can be simultaneously linearized. In fact the problem can be easily reduced to the following: given the germs of holomorphic functions $f(x,y) = yU(x,y)$, $f^o(x,y) = y$ and $g(x,y) = x$ about the origin where $U \in \mathcal{O}_2^*$, find out $\Phi \in \mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ such that $\Phi^* f^o = f$ and $\Phi^* g = g$. If we let $\Phi(x,y) = (a(x,y), b(x,y))$, then the problem reduces to the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} b(x,y) = yU(x,y); \\ a(x,y) = x. \end{cases}$$

whose solution is evident. The core of the proof of the following result is analogous (cf. (9.4)).

**Lemma 9.4.** *For each $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega^o,f}$ and each $j = 1, \ldots, \ell-1$ (respect. $j = \ell+1, \ldots, n$) there is $\Psi_j \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j)$ such that $f^{lin}_- = \Psi_{j*} f_-$ (respect. $f^{lin}_+ = \Psi_{j*} f_+$).*

*Proof.* We prove the result for the positive branch, the negative one being completely analogous. In view of the second part of Lemma 9.2, one just have to find a solution $\Phi_j := \Psi_j^{-1} := (a_j(t_j, x_j), b_j(t_j, x_j))$ to the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_j^* \widetilde{f}^{lin}(t_j, x_j) = \widetilde{f}^o(t_j, x_j) \\ \Phi_j^* \widetilde{g}(t_j, x_j) = \widetilde{g}(t_j, x_j) \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} a_j(t_j,x_j)^{\nu_j} b_j(t_j,x_j)_j{}^{\mu_j} = t_j^{\nu_j} x_j^{\mu_j} U(t_j, x_j) \\ a_j(t_j,x_j)^{r_j} b_j(t_j,x_j)^{s_j} = t_j^{r_j} x_j^{s_j} \end{cases} \tag{9.4}$$

But this can be given in the affine charts $(t_j, x_j)$ by

$$\begin{cases} a_j(t_j, x_j) = t_j [U(t_j, x_j)]^{\frac{s_j}{\nu_j s_j - \mu_j r_j}}, \\ b_j(t_j, x_j) = x_j [U(t_j, x_j)]^{\frac{r_j}{\mu_j r_j - \nu_j s_j}}, \end{cases}$$

which is well defined by (9.3). A straightforward calculation shows that the expression of $\Phi_j$ in the affine chart $(u_j, y_j)$ is given by

$$\Phi_j(u_j, y_j) = (u_j [V(u_j, y_j)]^{\frac{s_j}{\mu_j r_j - \nu_j s_j}}, y_j [V(u_j, y_j)]^{\frac{r_j - k_j s_j}{\mu_j r_j - \nu_j s_j}})$$

where $V(u_j, y_j) := U(1/u_j, u_j^{k_j} y_j) \in \mathcal{O}^*(\mathbb{D}_\epsilon, \mathbb{D}_{1+\epsilon})$. □

**Remark 9.2.** *As a straightforward consequence of the above lemma, there is a system of coordinates $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_j := \{(\widetilde{t}_j, \widetilde{x}_j), (\widetilde{u}_j, \widetilde{y}_j) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \widetilde{u}_j = 1/\widetilde{t}_j, \widetilde{y}_j = \widetilde{t}_j^{k_j} \widetilde{x}_j\}$ for $\mathbb{H}_j(-k_j)$ such that the first integrals of $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j$ are given respectively by $\widetilde{t}_j^{\nu_j} x_j^{\mu_j}$, $\widetilde{u}_j^{k_j \mu_j - \nu_j} \widetilde{y}_1^{\mu_j}$ and $\widetilde{t}_j^{r_j} \widetilde{x}_j^{s_j}$, $\widetilde{u}_j^{k_j s_j - r_j} \widetilde{y}_j^{s_j}$ for all $j \neq \ell$.*

Now we enrich a lit bit the structure preserved by the cocyles.

**Lemma 9.5.** *Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega^o,f}$, then there is a collection of projective charts $(\Phi_j)$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}^o$ such that $\Phi_j \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j)$ for all $j = 1,\dots,n$, $\Phi_j \circ \Phi_{j+1}^{-1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}^o)$ for all $j = \ell,\dots,n-1$ and $\Phi_j \circ \Phi_{j+1}^{-1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}^o)$ for all $j = 1,\dots,\ell-1$.*

*Proof.* From Lemma 9.3 one knows that there is a collection of projective charts $(\Upsilon_j)$ for $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}^o$ and first integrals $f_+$ for $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}$ and $f_-$ for $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}$ adapted to $(\mathcal{F}^o, f_+^o, f_-^o)$, where $\Upsilon_\ell \in \mathrm{Fix}(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$; thus we let $\Phi_\ell := \Upsilon_\ell$. Now we construct $\Phi_j$ for $j \neq \ell$. From Lemma 9.4 there are $\Psi_j, \Xi_j \in \mathrm{Diff}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^{lin}}(\mathcal{H}_j, D_j)$ such that $\Xi_{j*}(f_+) = f_+^{lin}$ (respect. $\Xi_{j*}(f_-) = f_-^{lin}$), $\Psi_{j*}(f_+^o) = f_+^{lin}$ (respect. $\Psi_{j*}(f_-^o) = f_-^{lin}$) and $\Xi_j, \Psi_j \in \mathrm{Fix}(\mathcal{G}_j)$. Then define $\Phi_j := \Psi_j^{-1} \circ \Xi_j$ in order to obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j & & \\ & {\scriptstyle \Phi_j}\swarrow & \circlearrowleft & \searrow{\scriptstyle \Xi_j} & \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o & & \xrightarrow{\Psi_j} & & \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^{lin} \end{array} \tag{9.5}$$

□

9.2.3. *Trivializing cocycles.* Here we follow the program outlined in §9.2.1 in order to trivialize the cocycles associated with a given fixed model. Recall that $f_+^o$ (respect. $f_-^o$) is the multivalued first integral for $\mathcal{B}_+\mathcal{F}^o$ (respect. $\mathcal{B}_-\mathcal{F}^o$).

**Lemma 9.6.** *Let $\Psi_{j,j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,j+1}^{lin}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j,j+1})$ for $j = 1,\dots,n-1$. Then $\Psi_{j,j+1}$ has a unique extension to $\Psi_{j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j+1}^{lin}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j+1})$ for all $j \geq \ell$. Analogously, $\Psi_{j,j+1}$ has a unique extension to $\Psi_j \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^{lin}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j)$ for all $j < \ell$.*

*Proof.* We prove the first part of the Lemma, the second one being completely analogous. We adopt the coordinate system $\mathcal{A}$ introduced in (9.2). Notice that the corner $c_{j,j+1} = D_j \cap D_{j+1}$ is represented by the origin in the affine chart $(t_{j+1}, x_{j+1})$ for $\mathcal{H}_{j+1}$, thus $\Phi_{j,j+1}(t_{j+1}, x_{j+1}) = (a_{j+1}(t_{j+1}, x_{j+1}), b_{j+1}(t_{j+1}, x_{j+1}))$ where $a_{j+1}, b_{j+1} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}_{\epsilon_1} \times \mathbb{D}_{\epsilon_2})$. Since $\Phi_{j,j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,j+1}^{lin}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j,j+1})$, then (denoting $i := j+1$ for simplicity) $a_i$ and $b_i$ satisfy the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} a_i(t_i, x_i)^{\nu_i} b_i(t_i, x_i)^{\mu_i} = t_i^{\nu_i} x_i^{\mu_i} \\ a_i(t_i, x_i)^{r_i} b_i(t_i, x_i)^{s_i} = t_i^{r_i} x_i^{s_i} \end{cases}$$

whose solutions are of the form $a_i(t_i, x_i) = \alpha t_i$ and $b_i(t_i, x_i) = \beta x_i$ where $\alpha, \frac{1}{\beta}$ are $(\nu_i s_i - \mu_i r_i)$-roots of unity. The uniqueness is straightforward since both $\Phi_{j,j+1}$ and its extension $\Phi_{j+1}$ are holomorphic. □

Now we are in a position to show that the cocycles generated by generic elements of $\mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega^o,f}$ are in fact trivial.

**Lemma 9.7.** *Let $\Phi_{j,j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,j+1}^o) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j,j+1})$ for $j = 1,\dots,n-1$. Then $\Phi_{j,j+1}$ has a unique extension to $\Phi_{j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j+1}^o) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j+1})$ for all $j \geq \ell$. Analogously, $\Phi_{j,j+1}$ has a unique extension to $\Phi_j \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_j^o) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j)$ for all $j < \ell$.*

*Proof.* We prove the first part of the Lemma, since the second one is completely analogous. Let $(\Psi_j) \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_j)$, $j = 1,\dots,n$, be the collection of maps introduced in Lemma 9.4 and $\overline{\Phi}_{j,j+1} := \Psi_{j+1} \circ \Phi_{j,j+1} \circ (\Psi_{j+1})^{-1}$. Since $\Psi_{j*} f_+^o = f_+^{lin}$, then $\overline{\Phi}_{j,j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j,j+1}^{lin}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j,j+1})$ for all $j = \ell,\dots,n-1$ (cf. (9.5)). Hence Lemma 9.6 assures that $\overline{\Phi}_{j,j+1}$ can be extended to $\overline{\Phi}_{j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j+1}^{lin}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j+1})$ for all $j = \ell,\dots,n-1$. Therefore, $\Phi_{j+1} := (\Psi_{j+1})^{-1} \circ \overline{\Phi}_{j+1} \circ \Psi_{j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{j+1}^o) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j+1})$ extends $\Phi_{j,j+1}$. A similar reasoning works for all $j < \ell$. □

9.2.4. *Extending semi-local conjugations.* Here we use all the machinery developed above in order to prove Theorem B. In fact, we show that the vanishing of the cocycles in the positive (respect. negative) branch means that we can extend to the positive (respect. negative) branch any conjugation from $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_\ell$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_\ell$.

*Proof of Theorem B.* Let $\mathcal{F}^o \in \mathcal{QHS}^c_{\omega^o,f}$ where $(\mathcal{F}^o : \omega^o = 0)$ is a fixed model. Let $(\Phi_j)$ be a collection of projective charts given by Lemma 9.5 and $\Phi_{i,j} := \Phi_i \circ \Phi_j^{-1}$. Then Lemma 9.7 ensures that there is $\Xi_{\ell+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{\ell+1}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{\ell+1})$ such that $\Xi_{\ell+1} = \Phi_{\ell,\ell+1}$. Let $(\Phi^{(1)}_j)$ be given by $\Phi^{(1)}_j := \Phi_j$ for all $j \neq \ell+1$ and $\Phi^{(1)}_{\ell+1} := \Xi_{\ell+1} \circ \Phi_{\ell+1}$. Then $(\Phi^{(1)}_j)$ is a collection of projective charts such that $\Phi^{(1)}_{j,j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{j,j+1}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j,j+1})$ and $\Phi^{(1)}_{\ell,\ell+1} = \mathrm{id}$. Repeating inductively the same arguments for $j > \ell+1$ we obtain a collection of projective charts $(\Phi^{(n-\ell)}_j)$ such that $\Phi^{(n-\ell)}_{j,j+1} \in \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o_{j,j+1}) \cap \mathrm{Fix}(\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}_{j,j+1})$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and $\Phi^{(n-\ell)}_{j,j+1} = \mathrm{id}$ for all $j \geq \ell$. An analogous reasoning works for all $j < \ell$, generating a collection of projective charts $(\Phi^{(n-1)}_j)$ such that $\Phi^{(n-1)}_{j,j+1} = \mathrm{id}$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$. In particular, this family paste together in order to define a map $\Phi \in \mathrm{Diff}(M, D)$ such that $\Phi_* \widetilde{\mathcal{F}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}^o$, as desired. □

## References


[1] Arnold V. I. *Chapitres supplémentaires de la théorie des équations différentielles ordinaires.* Editions Mir, Moscou 1980.

[2] Berzolari, L. *Allgemeine Theorie der höhernen alagebrischen Kurven.* Enzyklopädie der math. Wissenschaften, Bd. III 2, 1, 313-455 (1906);

[3] Brieskorn, E. *Beispiele zur Differentietopologie von Singularitäten.* Invent. Math. **2** (1966), 1-14;

[4] Berthier M., Meziani R. & Sad P. *On the classification of nilpotent singularities*, Bull. Sci. Math. **123** nº **5** (1999), 351-370.

[5] Camacho C. & Sad P. *Invariant varieties through singularities of holomorphic vector fields,* Ann. of Math. (2) **115** (1982), 579-595.

[6] Camacho C. A. Lins-Neto & Sad P. *Topological invariants and equidesingularization for holomorphic vector fields*, J. Diff. Geom. **20** (1984), 143–174.

[7] Camacho C. & Scárdua B. A. *The transcendence of solutions of complex differential equations*, in Ecuationes diferenciales y singularidades (J. M. Fernandez, éd.), Universidad de Valladolid, 1995, p. 79–102.

[8] Camacho C. & Scárdua B. A. *Beyond Liouvillian transcendence*, Math. Res. Lett. 6 (1999), no. 1, p. 31–41.

[9] Camacho C. & Scárdua B. A. *Complex foliations with algebraic limit sets*, Astérisque (2000), no. 261, p. xi, 57–88, Géométrie complexe et systémes dynamiques (Orsay, 1995).

[10] Camacho C. & Scárdua B. A. *Holomorphic foliations with Liouvillian first integrals*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 21 (2001), no. 3, p. 717–756.

[11] Camacho C. & Scárdua B.A. *Erratum to: "Holomorphic foliations with Liouvillian first integrals"* [Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 21 (2001), no. 3, 717–756; MR1836428 (2002k:37080)]. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 23 (2003), no. 3, 985–987.

[12] Câmara L. M. *Non-linear analytic differential equations and their invariants.* IMPA preprint Série C 5/2001. http://www.preprint.impa.br/Shadows/SERIE_C/2001/5.html.

[13] Cerveau D. & Moussu R. *Groups d'automorphismes de* $(\mathbb{C}, 0)$ *et équations différentielles* $y\,dy + \cdots = 0$, Bull. Soc. Math. France **116** (1988), 459-488.

[14] Ehresmann C. *Catégories différentiable et géométrie différentielle, Chapitres I et II.* Sém. Soc. Can. Math. Montréal, 1961.

[15] Ehresmann C. *Catégories et structures.* Dunod, Paris, 1965.

[16] Elizarov P.M., Il'yashenko YU. S., Shcherbakov A.A. & Voronin S.M. *Finitely generated groups of germs of one-dimensional conformal mappings, and invariants for complex singular points of analytic foliations of the complex plane.* Adv. Soviet Math. **14** (1993), 57-105.

[17] Genzmer Y. *Analytical and formal classifications of quasi-homogeneous foliations in* $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. J. Differential Equations 245 (2008), no. 6, 1656–1680.

[18] Grauert H. *Über Modifikationen und exzeptionelle analytische Mengen*, Math. Ann. **146** (1962), 331-368.

[19] Grothendieck A. *Sur la classification des fibrés holomorphe sur la sphere de Riemann*, Amer. J. Math. **79** (1957), 121-138.

[20] Haefliger A. *Structures feuilletées et cohomologie à valeur dans un faisceux de groupoïdes*, Comm. Math. Helv. **32** (1958), 248-329.
[21] Hefez A. & Hernandes M. E. *The analytic classification of plane branches*. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **43** (2011), no. 2, 289–298.
[22] Laufer H. B. *Normal two dimensional singularities*. Annals of mathematics Studies, No. 71. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1971.
[23] Lins-Neto A. *Construction of singular holomorphic vector fields and foliations in dimension two*, J. Diff. Geom. **26 (1)** (1987), 3-31.
[24] Mattei J.-F. *Quasihomogénéité et equireducibilité de feuilletages holomorphes em dimenson deux*. Astérisque 261, 2000, p.253-276.
[25] Mattei J.-F. & Moussu R. *Holonomie et intégrales premières,* Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup., 4$^{\text{e}}$ série, vol. **13** (1980), 469-523.
[26] Martinet J. & Ramis J.P. *Problèmes de modules pour des équations différentielles non-linéaires du premier ordre,* Publ. Math. I.H.E.S., vol **55 (**1982**),** 63-164**.**
[27] Martinet J. & Ramis J.-P. *Classification analytique des équations différentielles non-linéaires résonnantes du premier ordre*, Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup., 4$^{\text{e}}$ série, t. **16** (1983), 571-621.
[28] Moussu R. *Holonomie évanescente des équations différentielles dégénérées transverses,* Singularities and Dynamical Systems (Pnevmatikos, S.N., ed.), North-Holland, Amsterdam (1985), 161-173.
[29] Poincaré H. *Note sur les propriétés des fonctions définies par des équations différentielles*, J. Ec. Pol., **45**$^{\text{e}}$ cahier (1878), 13-26.
[30] Seindenberg A. *Reduction of the singularities of the differentiable equation* $Ady = Bdx$, Amer. J. Math **90** (1968), 248-269.
[31] Strozyna E. *Orbital formal normal forms for general Bogdanov-Takens singularity.* J. of Differential Equations **193** (2003), no. 1, 239–259.
[32] Yoccoz J.-C. *Linearisation des germes de diffeomorphismes holomorphes de* $(C, 0)$. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **306** (1988), no. 1, 55–58.
[33] Zariski O. *On the topology of algebroid singularities,* Amer. J. Math. **54** (1932), 453-465.

Departamento de Matemática, CCE-UFES, Av. Fernando Ferrari 514, Campus de Goiabeiras, Vitória-ES, 29075-910, Brazil.
*E-mail address*: leonardo.camara@ufes.br

Instituto de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
*E-mail address*: scardua@im.ufrj.br


x
t
u
-2
-1
y
$C_j^2$
$C_j^1$
π